

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated February 9, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendment to the Title, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

The Title is amended to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. No new matter is added. Thus, claims 1-48 are pending in the present application, and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

As a preliminary matter, the Office Action indicated that claims 10, 11, 15-24, 34, 35 and 39-48 contained allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten to be in independent form. Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the finding of allowable subject matter. As will be discussed below, all of claims 1-48 should be found allowable as submitted herein.

The Title was objected to for allegedly not being descriptive. Applicants amend the Title to recite "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR COMPRESSING A STREAM." Applicants submit that the Title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, and that the objection is rendered moot.

Claims 1, 4-7, 12, 25, 28-31 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,680,955 (Le). The Office Action took the position that Le taught all the elements of claims 1, 4-7, 12, 25, 28-31 and 36.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection and submit that Le fails to disclose or suggest all the features of any of the presently pending claims.

Claim 1, upon which claims 4-7 and 12 are dependent, recites a method for compressing a stream arriving at a compressor. The method includes acquiring a pattern at the compressor. The method also includes making sure a decompressor is synchronized with the compressor according to the pattern. The method also includes sending a compressed packet according to the pattern.

Claim 25, upon which claims 28-31 and 36 are dependent, recites a compressor for compressing a stream. The compressor includes a means for acquiring a pattern at the compressor. The compressor also includes a means for making sure a decompressor is synchronized with the compressor according to the pattern. The compressor also includes a means for sending a compressed packet according to the pattern.

As discussed in the specification, examples of the present invention enable a media stream to allow the compressor to get into the highest compression state, such as a second order state, more often. Thus, a compressed packet may include a compressed sequence number, and a compressed timestamp may be derived from the compressed sequence number. Applicants respectfully submit that Le fails to disclose or suggest all the features of any of the presently pending claims. Therefore, Le fails to provide the critical and unobvious advantages discussed above.

Le relates to a technique for compressing a header field in a data packet. Le describes a compressed header field that includes a calculated jitter effect that the

network before the compressor has on the transmission of packets and a calculated jitter effect the network between the compressor and decompressor has on the transmission of packets. Referring to Figure 5, the timers at the real-time transfer protocol (RTP) source 502 and at RTP receiver 504 have the same frequency but are not typically synchronized. An initialization header 508 is generated at RTP source 502, including an initial time stamp value, and is transmitted to the access network infrastructure (ANI) to be forwarded to RTP receiver 504. The time stamp in the initialization header is not compressed. Upon receipt at RTP receiver 504, the initial time stamp is stored in memory along with a time stamp stride. RTP source 502 then generates the next RTP packet having a time stamp set at a period after the initial time stamp. The next RTP packet and its time stamp is compressed and sent to RTP receiver 504. RTP receiver 502 decompresses the time stamp of the next RTP packet using the initial time stamp and a corrected value relating to jitter.

Applicants submit that Le fails to disclose or suggest all the features of any of the presently pending claims. For example, applicants submit that Le fails to disclose or suggest making sure a decompressor is synchronized with the compressor according to a pattern. As noted above, RTP source 502 and RTP receiver 504 of Le are not typically synchronized. Applicants submit Le fails to perform any synchronization processes in compressing or sending the RTP packets between RTP source 502 and RTP receiver 504. When the RTP packets of Le are compressed and decompressed, applicants submit that RTP source 502 and RTP receiver 504 fail to perform any synchronization operations

according to a pattern. Thus, a pattern used at an RTP source would not have any effect on an RTP receiver according to Le.

Applicants also submit that Le fails to disclose or suggest sending a compressed packet according to the pattern. Le describes sending an initial time stamp, which is not compressed, that is followed by a next time stamp, which is compressed. Applicants submit that Le fails to send the initial time stamp or the next time stamp, even if compressed, according to a pattern. In fact, applicants submit that Le fails to compress the RTP packets according to any pattern. Instead, the packets are compressed, without a pattern, when they are generated by RTP source 502.

In contrast, claim 1 recites “making sure a decompressor is synchronized with the compressor according to the pattern” and “sending a compressed packet according to the pattern.” Claim 25 recites “a means for making sure a decompressor is synchronized with the compressor according to the pattern” and “a means for sending a compressed packet according to the pattern.” Applicants respectfully submit, based on the reasons given above, that Le fails to disclose or suggest at least these features of the presently pending claims.

With respect to the dependent claims, applicants submit that claims 4-7, 12, 28-31 and 36 are allowable for at least the reasons given above, and because they recite additional patentable subject matter. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that Le fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 1, 4-7, 12, 25, 28-31 and 36. Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 8-9, 13, 14, 26, 27, 32, 33, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Le in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,209 (Hamiti et al.). The Office Action took the position that Le taught all the elements of claims 2-3, 8-9, 13, 14, 26, 27, 32, 33, 37 and 38 except detecting a marker bit in the packet stream. The Office Action then alleged that Hamiti provided those elements of the claims missing from Le. Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection for the reasons provided below.

Claim 2, upon which claims 3, 13 and 14 are dependent, depends directly from claim 1. Claim 1 is summarized above. Applicants submit that claim 2 includes the features of claim 1, and also includes the features of the stream being an RTP packet stream and the pattern including a TS function, a M-bit function, a quotient and a TS increment. The step of making sure includes sending the pattern.

Claim 8, upon which claim 9 is dependent, depends directly from claim 1. Claim 1 is summarized above. Applicants submit that claim 8 includes the features of claim 1, and also includes the features of the stream including a first packet having a first sequence number and a first M bit. The stream includes a second packet having a second sequence number and a second M bit. The method further includes acquiring the first packet and the second packet and detecting that the second sequence number is one more than the first sequence number and that the first M bit and the second M bit are set.

Claim 26, upon which claims 27 and 37 are dependent, depends directly from claim 25. Claim 25 is summarized above. Applicants submit that claim 26 includes the

features of claim 25, and also includes the features of the stream being an RTP packet stream and the pattern including a TS function, a M-bit function, a quotient and a TS increment. The means for making sure includes a means for sending the pattern.

Claim 32, upon which claim 33 is dependent, depends directly from claim 25. Claim 25 is summarized above. Applicants submit that claim 32 includes the features of claim 25, and also includes the features of the stream including a first packet having a first sequence number and a first M bit. The stream includes a second packet having a second sequence number and a second M bit. The compressor also includes a means for acquiring the first packet and the second packet and a means for detecting that the second sequence number is one more than the first sequence number and that the first M bit and the second M bit are set.

Claim 38 depends directly from claim 25. Claim 25 is summarized above. Applicants submit that claim 38 includes the features of claim 25 and also includes the features of the stream being an RTP packet stream and the pattern includes a TS function expressed as a staircase function of the packet SN. The staircase function has at least one staircase step and an M-bit function. The means for making sure includes a means for sending the pattern.

Applicants note that Le is assigned to Nokia Networks Oy, and the sole inventor of Le also is listed as a joint inventor in the present application. Applicants also note that Hamiti is assigned to Nokia Mobile Phones, Ltd. The present application is assigned to Nokia Corporation. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)(1), subject matter developed by another

“person,” which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), “shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.” Applicants respectfully submit that Le and Hamiti be withdrawn as prior art references according to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)(1).

As noted above, Le, Hamiti and the subject matter of the present application were owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person, Nokia Corporation, at the time the invention was made. Le and Hamiti both qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Though Le is assigned to Nokia Networks Oy and Hamiti is assigned to Nokia Mobile Phones, Ltd., applicants submit that these corporate entities are all part of Nokia Corporation, the assignee of the present application. Therefore, Le and Hamiti are disqualified as prior art references in the rejection of claims 2-3, 8-9, 13-14, 26-27, 32-33 and 37-38. Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants further submit that each of claims 1-48 recite allowable subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited references. Applicants therefore respectfully request that all of claims 1-48 be allowed, and this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William F. Nixon', written over a horizontal line.

William F. Nixon  
Registration No. 44,262

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

WFN:noe:dll